



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/678,419	10/03/2003	Neil McLellan	50626.59	1002

35510 7590 03/08/2005

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
10400 EATON PLACE
SUITE 312
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

EXAMINER

TRAN, MAI HUONG C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2818

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/678,419

Applicant(s)

MCLELLAN ET AL.

Examiner

Mai-Huong Tran

Art Unit

2818

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to Amendment filed on 01/14/2005.

Claims 1-17 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,069,023 to Bernier et al.

Claims 1-6 are rejected for the same reason as set forth in the previous Office Action.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,583,513 to Utagikar et al.

Claims 1 and 7-8 are rejected for the same reason as set forth in the previous Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,583,513 to Utagikar et al. in view of the remark.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected for the same reason as set forth in the previous Office Action.

Claims 11, 12, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,069,023 to Bernier et al. in view of the remark.

Claims 11, 12, 16 and 17 are rejected for the same reason as set forth in the previous Office Action.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,069,023 to Bernier et al. in view of Chen et al. (Pub. No. US 2003/0150595).

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reason as set forth in the previous Office Action.

Claims 14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,069,023 to Bernier et al. in view of Alcoe et al. (US 6,570,259).

Claims 14 and 18 are rejected for the same reason as set forth in the previous Office Action.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,069,023 to Bernier et al. in view of Shaw et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,330,701).

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reason as set forth in the previous Office Action.

Response to Arguments

Bernier teaches in claim 36 (col. 15, lines 34-36) that “selecting an aluminum alloy for the heat sink” and Utagikar teaches “the lid 144 is made of a metal or metal alloy and serves to conduct heat away from the integrated circuit (col. 6, lines 29-31).

Also, an intermetallic material is clearly a metal alloy that composed of two or more metals or of a metal and a nonmetal.

Therefore, for the above reason, it is believed that the rejection should be sustained. Feature of an invention not found in the claims can be given no patentable weight in distinguishing the claimed invention over the prior art.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication on earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mai-Huong Tran, (571) 272-1796. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM. The examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on (571) 272-1787.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7724. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.


Mai-Huong Tran


David Nelms
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800